

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} ) \\ ) \\ ) \\ ) \\ ) \\ ) \\ ) \\ ) \\ ) \\ ) \end{array} \right\}$$

7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

1 if the court is convinced that a plaintiff will be unable to state a claim for relief.” *Tradebay LLC V.*  
2 *eBay, Inc.*, 278 F.R.D. 597, 603 (D. Nev. 2011). Courts considering stays in this district have found  
3 that this standard is not easily met (*Kor Media Grp., LLC v. Green*, 294 F.R.D. 579, 583 (D. Nev.  
4 2013)), and that “[a]bsent extraordinary circumstances, litigation should not be delayed simply  
5 because a non-frivolous motion has been filed.” *Id.* (quoting *Trzaska v. Int’l Game Tech.*, 2011 WL  
6 1233298, at \*3 (D. Nev. Mar. 29, 2011)).

7 To determine whether a stay of a potentially dispositive motion is appropriate, courts in this  
8 district take a “preliminary peek” at the motion. *See Tradebay*, 278 F.R.D. 602-603. This inquiry is  
9 not meant to prejudge the motion, but rather to determine whether a stay would help the court to  
10 secure the “just, speedy, and inexpensive determination” of the action as required by Rule 1 of the  
11 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *See Id.*

12 Here, Defendants argue that their motion to dismiss is potentially dispositive, while Plaintiff  
13 argues that the Court should not consider the motion to be dispositive because he would likely be  
14 given leave to amend his complaint were the Court to grant the motion to dismiss. However, as the  
15 motion to dismiss does appear to move for dismissal of all current claims, the Court will treat the  
16 motion to dismiss as a dispositive motion.

17 The parties also disagree as to whether the motion may be adjudicated without further  
18 discovery, but the Court finds no binding authority for Plaintiff’s argument that discovery is  
19 necessary to flesh out its Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA) before a decision may be made on the  
20 motion to dismiss. The Court finds that no discovery is necessary to make a decision on the motion  
21 to dismiss, and will therefore move on to its preliminary peek.

22 Defendants argue that Plaintiff’s FCRA claim must be dismissed because it contains no  
23 specific facts and fails to allege any injury. After its preliminary peek, the Court is not convinced.  
24 While the complaint does not specify any dates, the complaint appears to be sufficiently specific as  
25 to the parties and their alleged actions to fairly inform Defendants of Plaintiff’s claim against it, and  
26 to give it an opportunity to defend itself effectively. Further, Plaintiff’s allegation that his credit  
27 score was affected may constitute an adequate harm to survive the motion to dismiss. While  
28

1 Defendants arguments to the contrary are not without merit, it does not appear at this stage that  
2 Defendant's position is so ironclad that it will certainly prevail. The preliminary peek has not  
3 convinced the Court that the motion to dismiss is certain to be granted, therefore a stay is not  
4 warranted at this time.

5 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendants' motion (ECF No. 25) to stay discovery is  
6 DENIED.

7  
8 DATED: May 24, 2017.

9  
10  
11   
12 C.W. Hoffman, Jr.  
13 United States Magistrate Judge  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28